UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,910	05/23/2007	Roland Walch	86503-123	1389
28291 7590 01/07/2009 FETHERSTONHAUGH - SMART & BIGGAR 1000 DE LA GAUCHETIERE WEST			EXAMINER	
			CHAWAN, SHEELA C	
SUITE 3300 MONTREAL, QC H3B 4W5		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CANADA			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/561,910	WALCH, ROLAND					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	SHEELA C. CHAWAN	2624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 De	ecember 2005						
<i>i</i>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
<u> </u>							
	Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application.						
<u> </u>	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	6) Claim(s) <u>1-7 and 32-40</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) <u>8-31</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 December 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/30/07.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te					

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Amendment

1. Preliminary amendment filed on 12/21/05 has been entered.

Claims 41- 90 are canceled.

Claims 1-40 are pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/30/07, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The Examiner has approved drawings filed on 12/21/05.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 5, lines 3 – 29 need correction.

Page 5, lines 3 – 5, change ";" to - - . - - .

Similarly brief **description of the drawings** needs appropriate correction is Required lines 3 - 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim(s) 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent¹ and recent Federal Circuit decisions² indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. While the instant claim(s) recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, the claim(s) neither transform underlying subject matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

¹ Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

² In re Bilski, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Art Unit: 2624

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-40 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1- 18 of copending Application No. 11/313,724. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because.

- Claims 1, 39 and 40 of the instant application and claims 1, 17 and 18, of copending application recites common subject matter;
- Whereby claims 1, 39 and 40 which recite the open ended transitional phrase "including", does not preclude the additional elements recited by claims 1, 17 and 18.
- Whereby the elements of claims 1, 39 and 40 are fully anticipated by copending application claims 1, 17, 18, anticipation is "the ultimate or epitome of obviousness" (*In re Kalm*, 154 USPQ 10 (CCPA 1967), also *In re Dailey*, 178 USPQ 293 (CCPA 1973) and *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA 1974)).

Furthermore, depends claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 32-38 of instant application correspond to claims 2-16 of copending application and therefore, they are also not patentably distinct from the claims of the copending application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

Application/Control Number: 10/561,910

Art Unit: 2624

7. Claims 8 - 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Page 5

Non of the prior art on record teaches or fairly suggests, the method defined in claim 7, wherein identifying the second pixel includes identifying which pixel having the designated shade value is nearest the first pixel as required by claim 8. and also wherein identifying the second pixel includes identifying which pixel separated from the first pixel by at least a minimum distance and having the designated shade value is nearest the first pixel as required by claim 9.

Claims 10 - 31 depend from the objected base claim 8 which depend from claim 1 as independent claim and therefore they are objected for the same reasons.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-40 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1- 31 of copending Application No. 11/313,821. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because.

- Claims 1, 39 and 40 of the instant application and claims 1 and 31, of copending application recites common subject matter;
- Whereby claims 1, 39 and 40 which recite the open ended transitional phrase "including", does not preclude the additional elements recited by claims 1 and 31.
- Whereby the elements of claims 1, 39 and 40 are fully anticipated by copending application claims 1 and 31, anticipation is "the ultimate or epitome of obviousness" (*In re Kalm*, 154 USPQ 10 (CCPA 1967), also *In re Dailey*, 178 USPQ 293 (CCPA 1973) and *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA 1974)).

Furthermore, depends claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 32-38 of instant application correspond to claims 2 - 30 of copending application and therefore, they are also not patentably distinct from the claims of the copending application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 2624

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 8 - 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Non of the prior art on record teaches or fairly suggests, the method defined in claim 7, wherein identifying the second pixel includes identifying which pixel having the designated shade value is nearest the first pixel as required by claim 8. And also wherein identifying the second pixel includes identifying which pixel separated from the first pixel by at least a minimum distance and having the designated shade value is nearest the first pixel as required by claim 9.

Claims 10 - 31 depend from the objected base claim 8 which depend from claim 1 as independent claim and therefore they are objected for the same reasons.

Art Unit: 2624

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sheela C Chawan whose telephone number is. 571-

272-7446. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7.30 - 6.00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Brian Werner can be reached on 571-272-7401. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-

8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have guestions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sheela C Chawan/

12/31/08

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624

Application/Control Number: 10/561,910

Page 9

Art Unit: 2624